

### REMARKS

Claims 1, 8, 13, 21, 28, 33, 38, 40, 44, 57, 63, 67 and 70 are amended. Claims 1-75 remain in the application for consideration. In view of the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application

### Advisory Action

In the present Advisory Action dated May 27, 2005, the Office considered the previously-filed request for reconsideration, but indicated that it did not place the application in condition for allowance. In the Advisory Action, the Office acknowledged Applicant's argument that Tucker (which the Office argues anticipates all of the claims) does not disclose a user defined editing project. Yet, the Office argued that Applicant's characterization of its user-defined editing project, as described in the specification, was not a part of the claims and hence, the Office was not amenable to considering the term "user defined editing project" or similar terms as defining over Tucker.

Applicant respectfully submits that the term "editing project" in the context of the various claims in which it is used sufficiently distinguishes over Tucker. Nonetheless, in an effort to advance prosecution in this matter, Applicant has amended its independent claims, as will be described below, in an effort to further clarify what is meant by the term "editing project".

Applicant submits that these clarifying amendments in no way narrow the claims in which they appear. Rather, these amendments serve only to further describe, in a non-limiting way, terminology that already appears in the claim,

1 which terminology would be interpreted in light of the specification and in view of  
2 the accepted canons of claim construction.

### 3 4 The Claims

5 Claim 1 has been amended and, as amended recites an editing system  
6 comprising [added language appears in bold italics]:

- 7
- 8 • a switch assembly comprising one or more software-implemented  
matrix switches, individual matrix switches comprising:
- 9 • one or more input pins configured to receive a data stream; and
- 10 • one or more output pins configured to output a data stream;
- 11 • the one or more input pins being routable to the one or more output  
pins, the switch assembly being configured to process both  
12 compressed and uncompressed data streams to provide a compressed  
output data stream that represents a user-defined editing project *in  
13 which a user can construct said editing project by operating on one  
or more sources of multimedia content that provide said data  
streams.*
- 14

15 In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that its subject  
16 matter is anticipated by Tucker. Applicant maintains its position with regard to  
17 Tucker as articulated in the previously-filed Office Action Response.  
18 Nonetheless, this claim has been amended, as noted above, to clarify the term  
19 "editing project". Support for the subject matter of this amendment can be found,  
20 among other places in Applicant's Specification, on page 27, line 14 through page  
21 28, line 18, the entirety of which is reproduced below for the convenience of the  
22 Office (emphasis added):

23  
24 Fig. 9 shows an overview of a process that takes a user-defined  
25 editing project and renders from it a data structure that can be used to  
program the matrix switch.

Specifically, a user-defined editing project is shown generally at 900. Typically, when a user *creates an editing project*, they can select from a number of different multimedia clips that they can then *assemble into a unique presentation*. Each individual clip represents a *source* of digital data or a source stream (e.g., multimedia content). Projects can include one or more sources 902. *In defining their project, a user can operate on sources in different ways*. For example, *video sources can have transitions 904 and effects 906 applied on them*. A transition object is a way to change between two or more sources. As discussed above, a transition essentially receives as input, two or more streams, operates on them in some way, and produces a single output stream. An exemplary transition can comprise, for example, fading from one source to another. An effect object can operate on a single source or on a composite of sources. An effect essentially receives a single input stream, operates on it in some way, and produces a single output stream. An exemplary effect can comprise a black-and-white effect in which a video stream that is configured for presentation in color format is rendered into a video stream that is configured for presentation in black and white format. Unlike conventional effect filters, effect object 906 may well perform multiple effect tasks. That is, in accordance with one implementation, an effect object (e.g., 906) may actually perform multiple tasks on the received input stream, wherein said tasks would require multiple effect filters in a conventional filter graph system.

An exemplary user interface 908 is shown and represents what a user might see when they *produce a multimedia project* with software executing on a computer. In this example, the user has selected three sources A, B, and C, and has assembled the sources into a project timeline. *The project timeline defines when the individual sources are to be rendered, as well as when any transitions and/or effects are to occur*.

As Tucker neither discloses nor suggests any such subject matter, Applicant respectfully submits that this claim is allowable.

Claims 2-7 depend from claim 1 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 1, are neither disclosed nor suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination with one another.

1       **Claim 8** has been amended and, as amended, recites an editing system  
2 comprising [added language appears in bold italics]:

- 3       • a media processing object configured to:
- 4           ○ receive multiple data streams comprising compressed and  
5           uncompressed data streams; and
  - 6           ○ process the one or more data streams to provide a compressed  
7           output data stream that represents a *user-defined* media  
8           project *in which a user can construct the media project by*  
9           *operating on one or more sources of multimedia content.*

10       In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that its subject  
11 matter is anticipated by Tucker. Applicant maintains its position with regard to  
12 Tucker as articulated in the previously-filed Office Action Response.  
13 Nonetheless, this claim has been amended, as noted above, to clarify the term  
14 “media project”. As Tucker neither discloses nor suggests any such subject  
15 matter, this claim is allowable.

16       **Claims 9-12** depend from claim 8 and are allowable as depending from an  
17 allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited  
18 features which, in combination with those recited in claim 8, are neither disclosed  
19 nor suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination with one  
20 another.

21       **Claim 13** has been amended and, as amended, recites a multi-media editing  
22 system comprising [added language appears in bold italics]:

- 23       • a switch assembly comprising one or more software-implemented  
24       matrix switches, individual matrix switches comprising:
- 25       • one or more input pins configured to receive a data stream; and
  - one or more output pins configured to output a data stream;

- the one or more input pins being routable to the one or more output pins, the switch assembly being configured to process both compressed and uncompressed data streams to provide a compressed output data stream that represents a user-defined multi-media editing project *in which a user can construct the multi-media editing project by operating on one or more sources of multimedia content that provide said data streams*; and
- one or more data structures associated with the switch assembly and configured for use in programming the switch assembly to provide a routing scheme for routing input pins to output pins for a given multi-media editing project time line.

In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that its subject matter is anticipated by Tucker. Applicant maintains its position with regard to Tucker as articulated in the previously-filed Office Action Response. Nonetheless, this claim has been amended, as noted above, to clarify the term "editing project". As Tucker neither discloses nor suggests any such subject matter, this claim is allowable.

Claims 14-20 depend from claim 13 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 13, are neither disclosed nor suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination with one another.

Claim 21 has been amended and, as amended, recites a multi-media editing system comprising [added language appears in bold italics]:

- a switch assembly comprising one or more non-hardware matrix switches, individual matrix switches comprising:
  - one or more input pins configured to receive a data stream; and
  - one or more output pins configured to output a data stream;

- the one or more input pins being routable to the one or more output pins, the switch assembly being configured to process both compressed and uncompressed data streams to provide a compressed output data stream that represents a user-defined multi-media editing project *in which a user can construct said editing project by operating on one or more sources of multimedia content that provide said data streams.*

In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that its subject matter is anticipated by Tucker. Applicant maintains its position with regard to Tucker as articulated in the previously-filed Office Action Response. Nonetheless, this claim has been amended, as noted above, to clarify the term "editing project". As Tucker neither discloses nor suggests any such subject matter, this claim is allowable.

Claims 22-27 depend from claim 21 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 21, are neither disclosed nor suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination with one another.

Claim 28 has been amended and, as amended, recites an media processing system comprising [added language appears in bold italics]:

- switch means for receiving compressed and uncompressed data streams associated with sources that are to be incorporated into a *user-defined editing project in which a user can construct said editing project by operating on one or more sources of multimedia content that provide said data streams, said switch means* processing the compressed and uncompressed data streams to provide a single compressed output stream that represents the project; and

- programming means associated with the switch means and configured to program the switch means to provide the single compressed output stream.

In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that its subject matter is anticipated by Tucker. Applicant maintains its position with regard to Tucker as articulated in the previously-filed Office Action Response. Nonetheless, this claim has been amended, as noted above, to clarify the term "editing project". As Tucker neither discloses nor suggests any such subject matter, this claim is allowable.

Claims 29-32 depend from claim 28 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 28, are neither disclosed nor suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination with one another.

**Claim 33** has been amended and, as amended, recites a multi-media editing system comprising [added language appears in bold italics]:

- a first software-implemented matrix switch comprising one or more input pins and one or more output pins, the one or more input pins being routable to the one or more output pins, the first matrix switch being configured to process one or more uncompressed data streams and output an uncompressed data stream;
- a second software-implemented matrix switch comprising one or more input pins and one or more output pins, the one or more input pins being routable to the one or more output pins, the second matrix switch being configured to process one or more compressed data streams and output a compressed data stream; and
- a third software-implemented matrix switch comprising multiple input pins and multiple output pins, the input pins being routable to one or more output pins, the third matrix switch being configured to receive an uncompressed data stream from the first switch and a

1 compressed data stream from the second switch and process the  
2 received data streams to provide a single compressed output data  
3 stream that represents a user-defined multi-media editing project *in*  
4 *which a user can construct said editing project by operating on one*  
5 *or more sources of multimedia content that provide said data*  
6 *streams.*

7 In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that its subject  
8 matter is anticipated by Tucker. Applicant maintains its position with regard to  
9 Tucker as articulated in the previously-filed Office Action Response.  
10 Nonetheless, this claim has been amended, as noted above, to clarify the term  
11 "editing project". As Tucker neither discloses nor suggests any such subject  
12 matter, this claim is allowable.

13 **Claims 34-37** depend from claim 33 and are allowable as depending from  
14 an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited  
15 features which, in combination with those recited in claim 33, are neither disclosed  
16 nor suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination with one  
17 another.

18 **Claim 38** has been amended and, as amended, recites a multi-media editing  
19 system comprising [added language appears in bold italics]:

- 20 • first software switch means for processing one or more  
21 uncompressed data streams to provide an uncompressed data stream,  
22 the switch means comprising at least one feedback loop that  
23 modifies a data stream that is output by the switch means and  
24 provides the modified data stream as an input to the switch means;
- 25 • second software switch means for processing one or more  
compressed data streams to provide a compressed data stream; and
- a third software switch means for receiving an uncompressed data  
stream from the first software switch means and a compressed data  
stream from the second software switch and processing the received  
data streams to provide a single compressed output data stream that



1 represents a user-defined multi-media editing project *in which a*  
2 *user can construct said editing project by operating on one or more*  
3 *sources of multimedia content that provide said data streams.*

4 In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that its subject  
5 matter is anticipated by Tucker. Applicant maintains its position with regard to  
6 Tucker as articulated in the previously-filed Office Action Response.  
7 Nonetheless, this claim has been amended, as noted above, to clarify the term  
8 "editing project". As Tucker neither discloses nor suggests any such subject  
9 matter, this claim is allowable.

10 Claim 39 depends from claim 38 and is allowable as depending from an  
11 allowable base claim. This claim is also allowable for its own recited features  
12 which, in combination with those recited in claim 38, are neither disclosed nor  
13 suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination with one  
14 another.

15 Claim 40 has been amended and, as amended, recites a multi-media editing  
16 system comprising [added language appears in bold italics]:

- 17
- 18 • a first software-implemented matrix switch comprising one or more  
19 input pins and one or more output pins, the one or more input pins  
20 being routable to the one or more output pins, the first matrix switch  
21 being configured to process one or more uncompressed data streams  
22 and output an uncompressed data stream;
  - 23 • a second software-implemented matrix switch comprising one or  
24 more input pins and one or more output pins, the one or more input  
25 pins being routable to the one or more output pins, the second matrix  
switch being configured to process one or more compressed data  
streams and output a compressed data stream;
  - a third software-implemented matrix switch comprising multiple  
input pins and multiple output pins, the input pins being routable to  
one or more output pins, the third matrix switch being configured to  
receive an uncompressed data stream from the first switch and a

1 compressed data stream from the second switch and process the  
2 received data streams to provide a single compressed output data  
3 stream that represents a user-defined multi-media editing project *in*  
4 *which a user can construct said editing project by operating on one*  
5 *or more sources of multimedia content that provide said data*  
6 *streams; and*

- 7 • one or more data structures associated with at least some of the  
8 matrix switches and configured for use in programming the  
9 associated switches to provide a routing scheme for routing input  
10 pins to output pins.

11 In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that its subject  
12 matter is anticipated by Tucker. Applicant maintains its position with regard to  
13 Tucker as articulated in the previously-filed Office Action Response.  
14 Nonetheless, this claim has been amended, as noted above, to clarify the term  
15 "editing project". As Tucker neither discloses nor suggests any such subject  
16 matter, this claim is allowable.

17 Claims 41-43 depend from claim 40 and are allowable as depending from  
18 an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited  
19 features which, in combination with those recited in claim 40, are neither disclosed  
20 nor suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination with one  
21 another.

22 Claim 44 has been amended and, as amended, recites a multi-media editing  
23 method comprising [added language appears in bold italics]:

- 24 • providing a switch assembly comprising one or more software-  
25 implemented matrix switches, individual matrix switches comprising  
one or more input pins and one or more output pins, the one or more  
input pins being routable to the one or more output pins, the switch  
assembly being configured to process both compressed and  
uncompressed data streams to provide a compressed output data  
stream that represents a user-defined multi-media editing project *in*

1 *which a user can construct said editing project by operating on one*  
2 *or more sources of multimedia content that provide said data*  
3 *streams; and*

- 4 • programming the switch assembly using one or more data structures,  
5 said programming providing a routing scheme for routing input pins  
6 to output pins for a given time period.

7 In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that its subject  
8 matter is anticipated by Tucker. Applicant maintains its position with regard to  
9 Tucker as articulated in the previously-filed Office Action Response.  
10 Nonetheless, this claim has been amended, as noted above, to clarify the term  
11 "editing project". As Tucker neither discloses nor suggests any such subject  
12 matter, this claim is allowable.

13 Claims 45-56 depend from claim 44 and are allowable as depending from  
14 an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited  
15 features which, in combination with those recited in claim 44, are neither disclosed  
16 nor suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination with one  
17 another.

18 Claim 57 has been amended and, as amended, recites one or more  
19 computer-readable media having computer-readable instructions thereon which,  
20 when executed by a computer, cause the computer to [added language appears in  
21 bold italics]:

- 22 • provide a switch assembly comprising multiple software-  
23 implemented matrix switches, individual matrix switches comprising  
24 one or more input pins and one or more output pins, the one or more  
25 input pins being routable to the one or more output pins, the switch  
assembly comprising:
  - a first switch configured to process uncompressed data streams to  
provide an uncompressed output data stream;

- a second switch configured to process compressed data streams to provide a compressed output data stream; and
- a third switch configured to receive both the uncompressed and compressed output data streams and process the data streams to provide a compressed output data stream that represents a user-defined multi-media editing project *in which a user can construct said editing project by operating on one or more sources of multimedia content that provide said data streams*; and
- program the switch assembly by defining a first grid structure containing data that defines an association between the first switch's input pins, at least one output pin and a time line defined by the editing project, and defining a second grid structure containing data that defines an association between the second switch's input pins, at least one output pin and the time line defined by the editing project.

In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that its subject matter is anticipated by Tucker. Applicant maintains its position with regard to Tucker as articulated in the previously-filed Office Action Response. Nonetheless, this claim has been amended, as noted above, to clarify the term "editing project". As Tucker neither discloses nor suggests any such subject matter, this claim is allowable.

Claims 58-62 depend from claim 57 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 57, are neither disclosed nor suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination with one another.

Claim 63 has been amended and, as amended, recites a multi-media editing method comprising [added language appears in bold italics]:

- providing a first software-implemented matrix switch comprising one or more input pins and one or more output pins, the one or more input pins being routable to the one or more output pins, the first

1 matrix switch being configured to process one or more  
2 uncompressed data streams and output an uncompressed data  
3 stream;

- 4 • providing a second software-implemented matrix switch comprising  
5 one or more input pins and one or more output pins, the one or more  
6 input pins being routable to the one or more output pins, the second  
7 matrix switch being configured to process one or more compressed  
8 data streams and output a compressed data stream;
- 9 • providing a third software-implemented matrix switch comprising  
10 multiple input pins and multiple output pins, the input pins being  
11 routable to one or more output pins;
- 12 • receiving, with the third matrix switch, an uncompressed data stream  
13 from the first switch and a compressed data stream from the second  
14 switch; and
- 15 • processing the received data streams with the third switch to provide  
16 a single compressed output data stream that represents a user-defined  
17 multi-media editing project *in which a user can construct said  
18 editing project by operating on one or more sources of multimedia  
19 content that provide said data streams.*

20 In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that its subject  
21 matter is anticipated by Tucker. Applicant maintains its position with regard to  
22 Tucker as articulated in the previously-filed Office Action Response.  
23 Nonetheless, this claim has been amended, as noted above, to clarify the term  
24 "editing project". As Tucker neither discloses nor suggests any such subject  
25 matter, this claim is allowable.

26 **Claims 64-66** depend from claim 63 and are allowable as depending from  
27 an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited  
28 features which, in combination with those recited in claim 63, are neither disclosed  
29 nor suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination with one  
30 another.

31 **Claim 67** has been amended and, as amended, recites one or more  
32 computer-readable media having computer-readable instructions thereon which,

1 when executed by a computer, cause the computer to [added language appears in  
2 bold italics]:

- 3 • process at least one compressed data stream to provide an output  
4 compressed data stream that comprises a portion of a user-defined  
5 multi-media editing project that is associated with a data stream  
6 source;
- 7 • process one or more uncompressed data streams to manipulate the  
8 one or more uncompressed data streams to provide an output  
9 uncompressed data stream that comprises a different portion of a  
10 user-defined multi-media editing project that is associated with one  
11 or more data stream sources;
- 12 • compress the output uncompressed data stream; and
- 13 • associate the output compressed data stream and the compressed  
14 output uncompressed data stream together to provide a compressed  
15 stream that represents a user-defined multi-media editing project *in*  
16 *which a user can construct said editing project by operating on one*  
17 *or more sources of multimedia content that provide said data*  
18 *streams.*

19 In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that its subject  
20 matter is anticipated by Tucker. Applicant maintains its position with regard to  
21 Tucker as articulated in the previously-filed Office Action Response.  
22 Nonetheless, this claim has been amended, as noted above, to clarify the term  
23 "editing project". As Tucker neither discloses nor suggests any such subject  
24 matter, this claim is allowable.

25 Claims 68-69 depend from claim 67 and are allowable as depending from  
an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited  
features which, in combination with those recited in claim 67, are neither disclosed  
nor suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination with one  
another.

1       **Claim 70** has been amended and, as amended, recites one or more  
2 computer-readable media having computer-readable instructions thereon which,  
3 when executed by a computer, cause the computer to [added language appears in  
4 **bold italics**]:

- 5       • receive and process one or more uncompressed data streams with a  
6 first software-implemented matrix switch comprising one or more  
7 input pins and one or more output pins, the one or more input pins  
8 being routable to the one or more output pins to output an  
uncompressed data stream;
- 9       • receive and process one or more compressed data streams with a  
10 second software-implemented matrix switch comprising one or more  
11 input pins and one or more output pins, the one or more input pins  
being routable to the one or more output pins to output a compressed  
data stream;
- 12       • receive and process the uncompressed data stream that is output by  
13 the first switch and the compressed data stream that is output by the  
14 second switch with a third software-implemented matrix switch  
comprising multiple input pins individual ones of which receive data  
15 streams, and one or more output pins individual ones of which  
provide data streams, the one or more input pins being routable to  
16 the one or more output pins to output, at one output pin, a  
compressed data stream that represents a user-defined multi-media  
17 editing project *in which a user can construct said editing project by  
operating on one or more sources of multimedia content that  
provide said data streams.*

18  
19       In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that its subject  
20 matter is anticipated by Tucker. Applicant maintains its position with regard to  
21 Tucker as articulated in the previously-filed Office Action Response.  
22 Nonetheless, this claim has been amended, as noted above, to clarify the term  
23 "editing project". As Tucker neither discloses nor suggests any such subject  
24 matter, this claim is allowable.  
25

1       **Claims 71-75** depend from claim 70 and are allowable as depending from  
2 an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited  
3 features which, in combination with those recited in claim 70, are neither disclosed  
4 nor suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination with one  
5 another.

6  
7       **Conclusion**

8       Applicant has sincerely made an attempt to advance prosecution in this  
9 matter. The Office continues to maintain its position with respect to Tucker.  
10 Applicant respectfully requests a Notice of Allowability be issued forthwith. In  
11 the event the next action is to be anything other than issuance of a Notice of  
12 Allowability, Applicant respectfully requests a telephone call for the purpose of  
13 scheduling an interview.

14  
15       Respectfully Submitted,

16  
17       Dated: 7/22/05

18       By: 

19       Lance R. Sadler  
20       Reg. No. 38,605  
21       (509) 324-9256